

From wang!elf.wang.com!ucsd.edu!info-hams-relay Fri Apr 5 23:00:57 1991 remote  
from tosspot  
Received: by tosspot (1.64/waf)  
via UUCP; Fri, 05 Apr 91 23:00:42 EST  
for lee  
Received: from somewhere by elf.wang.com id aa09861; Fri, 5 Apr 91 23:00:54 GMT  
Received: from ucsd.edu by relay1.UU.NET with SMTP  
(5.61/UUNET-shadow-mx) id AA03537; Fri, 5 Apr 91 16:08:41 -0500  
Received: by ucsd.edu; id AA13764  
sendmail 5.64/UCSD-2.1-sun  
Fri, 5 Apr 91 11:23:46 -0800 for nixbur!schroeder.pad  
Received: by ucsd.edu; id AA13676  
sendmail 5.64/UCSD-2.1-sun  
Fri, 5 Apr 91 11:23:07 -0800 for /usr/lib/sendmail -oc -odb -oQ/var/spool/  
lqueue -oi -finfo-hams-relay info-hams-list  
Message-Id: <9104051923.AA13676@ucsd.edu>  
Date: Fri, 5 Apr 91 11:23:02 PST  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams-relay@ucsd.edu>  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V91 #272  
To: Info-Hams@ucsd.edu

Info-Hams Digest                      Fri, 5 Apr 91                      Volume 91 : Issue 272

Today's Topics:

Broadcast ID Requirements?  
Iambic? (2 msgs)  
Iambic Keying  
Icom IC-W2A Frequency Mod  
Info-Hams Digest V91 #271  
Large 110->220 Transformers.  
Licensing Philosophy  
Licensing Philosophy?  
Real info on scanner situation wanted  
STS-37 SAREX Operating Schedule  
Ultrasonics.  
Working with Phillystran

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official

policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 5 Apr 91 16:22:16 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Broadcast ID Requirements?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

What are the current legal requirements for IDing from broadcast stations, especially TV stations (including LPTV, translators, relays, etc.)?

Here in St. Louis, there is a new station (at least I just discovered it last weekend) on channel 18. It relays the TBN (Trinity Broadcasting Network) religious service, and every time I've listened at the hour or half-hour, hoping to see an ID with the local call letters or hear a voice-over announcement, especially wanting to learn just where their transmitter site is, there has been absolutely \*nothing\*. There's a TBN generic spot at those times, and they often sloppily cut off the end of their own spot when the next gospel-huckster show starts up.

Are they in violation of some reg by not giving a clear local-station ID at those times, or is there some "out" for such relay-only broadcasters that lets them ID only at sign-on/sign-off times, or not even then?

If they are really this new, maybe they are operating in some sort of "test" mode, and have looser ID'ing requirements during that period. Could this be the case?

By the by, if any of the TV-station engineers out there on the net have access to current TV-broadcast references, could you see if channel 7, a LPTV station that was on the air here in St. Louis a while back, is still active? I used to get their signal weakly but readably, but it disappeared and I don't know if they went off the air, changed their antenna in such a way that reduced their signal at my location, or what... Also, channel 21 has come and gone, carrying a cheaper imitation of Home Shopping Club (if such is possible! :-)) called "Home Shopping Spree". Anyone know if that was a test or what? They gave no call letters either...

Channel 46 in East St. Louis, IL, carries the real HSC and has a reasonable signal, plus they carry a good amount of public-service discussions and info each hour, and shrink the HSC signal into a corner of the screen to show their local ID and run a weather crawl fairly frequently. Channel 58 carries a service called Jukebox which is a dial-a-900-number to request a music video, and shows an ID slide pretty regularly ("K58DH" or something like that); lots of raunchy rap videos and stuff like the Madonna one thst I'm surprised to see over-the-air, considering what restrictions I hear are on MTV and suchlike cable music-video services.... (I mention these just to complete the roster of

Regards, Will  
wmartin@stl-06sima.army.mil

```
In article <"5-Apr-91.11:20:07.GMT".*.hugh_davies.wgc1@rx.Xerox.com>
hugh_davies.wgc1@rx.xerox.COM writes:
>If an iambic keyer always sends an element at end of a character, of the
>opposite sense to the one you've just sent, e.g. *you* send dah-di-dah and *it*
>tags on another dit to make a 'C', then how do you send characters that end in
>two elements the same, like an 'L', or 'G'???
>
>Hugh, G0CNR.
```

Some misconception that is! All Iambic means is that the circuit is timed to prevent the classic "swing" of the old reed type keyer. The vibrating reed type keys allowed the operator to send dahs as long as they wanted by simply holding down the key. The other side of the key used a reed to make a string of dits that had two characteristics; 1 the spacing between the dits increased slightly as time went by. 2. the length of each dit decreased slightly as the string of dits goes on. Admittedly, the difference in timing of the dits is exceedingly small and some Hams will insist that it is undetectable, but it is probably these same guys that reminice about so and so's distinctive "fist."

An Iambic keyer keeps the timing straight so that a dit-length -say that carefully in mixed company 8-) - is the basic unit. Given that, the length of time between parts of a letter is a dit, and a Dah is 3 dits long. Classic spacing between characters is 2 dits and between words, 5. With a simple side swiper paddle on a keyer of this type (push it left it's a string of dits-push it right its a string of dahs) still allows the operator a somewhat, stilted delivery.

An Iambic keyer with a squeeze paddle -push the right paddle left gets dits push the left paddle right gets dahs squeeze them together gets alternating dit dah (or dah dit depending which one you hit first) is the ultimate (INMHO) cw pleasure machine. The self completeing dits and dahs and the alternating characteristic means I can work cw longer with less fatigue. AND Best of all, I don't have some cyber-ham (machine generated and read cw operator) telling me my fist is unreadable.

• •      • \_ \_ \_      • \_      • \_ \_ • • • • •      \_ •      \_ • • \_      \_ • • •      \_ • \_



Date: 5 Apr 91 17:48:09 GMT  
From: agate!darkstar!ucscb.UCSC.EDU!bemmack@ucbvax.berkeley.edu  
Subject: Icom IC-W2A Frequency Mod  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

What types of mods (diode clips/additions) are available to extend the xmit range of this receiver, and what is the usable out-of-band xmit range?

No flames, please, just facts. Thanks!

-Kirk J. Smith, EMT-1A, EMT-P Intern, Amateur License to Follow ;-)

-----  
Date: 5 Apr 91 17:54:51 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V91 #271  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

From: Larry Jack KL7GLK / V77LJ

RG8U and other colourful callsigns

Once upon a time a call like RG8U would have stuck out like the famous sore thumb. Now I'm not so sure that it would raise much more than a few eyebrows.

In the Good Old Days (Oh no, not another OF off in Oldtimers heaven) you could pretty well tell where someone was by his callsign. I would place the point of transition around the early '70's with the advent of the U.S.'s "Funny Calls." Don't get me wrong, I've have nothing against them, and for those that don't know what I am referring to they are the new 2X1, 2X2 calls that were opened up when the FCC began to deregulate life. With me they are fine, they are even fun. Try giving the call

KU2Q quickly in a pileup,..see? Or how about a QSL with W1MP? But what ham hasn't played head games with callsign alphabet soup? Certainly we all want that certain individuality that sets us apart from the crowd. And as Hams nothing more than our callsigns will ever come close. What I'm trying to lead up to a point, which is, as we all strive to become more unique that the next chap, we all seem to loose anything that is special. Again, don't get me wrong, the new callsigns are fun, easy(?), colourful & here to stay. But think a moment, you Old Farts, to the time when a prefix like KB6 could only have been something, something \*\*\*VERY RARE!!\*\*\* I found myself thinking this during lastweek's WPX contest,after working a 6I8 station,only to look up the international allocation (who keeps those rare things like 6I's in their heads?) to find it was Mexico. Sure sounded alot rarer than Mexico! Remember when they all were XE's? Of course this does have the effect of making practically anyone at least sound like rare

no matter where they are. I guess that being "rare" will just have to be measured by things other than callsigns. Having been on both side of the issue (the hunter as well as the hunted--)

.....I will pause briefly in silent reflection at this passing....and move on.

Which brings me to what I had set out originally to do, to tell all you new hams a little about the exciting origins and previous owners of what you may today consider everyday callsigns.

There was a time when KC4  
would cause world class pileups....

Back in the pre 1970's and to some extent even today a US callsign from the following areas were rare birds. Many as you can see, have been lumped under generic categories like KH# and other deleted completely as their status (relative to the US) changed, ie: KA#. Think your call is just one in a thousand? Take pride amigo, at look at its rich history!

KA6- These were private stations of Americans in Occupied Japan post WW2. Unlike state-side callsigns, these were assigned by the military commands and not the FCC. Seems I remember KA1's thru 0's with the KA8's being assigned to military club station, all the others were home stations. The Japanese authorities forbid JA's from talking to any KA's. To talk to a Japanese station you had to have a JA license. That's another story.

KB6 A rare one- The Bonnin (Spelling?) and Volcano Islands of the far pacific

KC's Both 4's and 6's existed, and like KB6's were outside the authority of the FCC. Antarctica and the Canton Islands respectfully. KC4USA etc. were the research stations that would be heard through the frequent solar flares. KC4 is still used there.

KG's Both 4's and 6's were used. The 4's are still heard from that sore Castro would like to forget, in Cuba. 6's were (still) Guam

KH6 Hawaii - The KH's (1, 2 etc.) replaced many of the following:

KJ6 Johnson Island. A real treat to work. Not much to visit (those of us who have wish they could have at least kept this as something unique...goodness knows they've little else out there) Again, assigned by the military

KL7 Alaska, still is though no more are assigned- NL7, WL7's today but it could change

KM6 Midway Island, Pacific

KN6 Old Novice class licenses from California

KP6 Palmyra and Jarvis Islands, Pacific. Rare then, Rare today. KH5 replaced KP6

KR6 Okinawa, same as the KA's above.

KS Both 4's and 6's. The 6's were Saipan, the 4's Swan Island. Swan was a CIA base on the coast of Central America. Working a real KS4 was to work a spy.

KT's Fortunately their never were any, but once there was a move afoot to have this as the prefix for Technician class licenses. Similar to the KN's and WN's

KV4 Still the Virgin Islands  
KW6 Wake Island, Pacific  
KX6 The Marshall Islands, now V7's. KX6BU Kwajalein was famous worldwide.  
KZ5 The Canal Zone in Panama.

Part 5 Experimental Radio Service Licenses used amateur radio callsigns except they would include an X in the suffix. For example KI2XNA- the X as the first letter always meant an experimental station. Since they were licensed for all kinds of things outside the ham bands, many hams tuning across these weird calls were easily upset. All legal though. The prefix could be anything, and the district (#) didn't reflect the Ham call districts.

Still think a KC6 is nothing.....?

Larry Jack KL7GLK (ex KX6LJ, KR6LJ  
KI2XNA etc.)

-----  
Date: 5 Apr 91 17:41:17 GMT  
From: decctrl!news.crl.dec.com!shlump.nac.dec.com!  
koning.enet.dec.com@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Large 110->220 Transformers.  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

|>...  
|>Also remember that much of Europe uses 240/250 volts, NOT 220V! This may  
|>result in the smoothing caps of a '220 volt' device being put under  
|>outside-design-limits voltages and shorten equipment life.  
|>Check with a meter first if you want to play safe.  
|>  
|>  
|> Pete Lucas PJML@UK.AC.NWL.IA G6WBJ@GB7SDN.GBR.EU

Not quite. The UK is 240 volts; all the rest of Europe is 220.  
(Actually, I'm not positive about Ireland; would someone confirm?)

Apart from that, any device that blows up when set for 220 but fed with  
240 is trash anyway.

paul

-----  
Date: 5 Apr 91 13:40:56 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!hollie.rdg.dec.com!ryn.mro4.dec.com!ultnix.enet.dec.com!  
taber@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Licensing Philosophy

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <12593@pt.cs.cmu.edu>, chiles@chiles.slisp.cs.cmu.edu (Bill Chiles) writes:

```
|>
|> In the case of the ham bands, you're tested on theory because the
|> license conveys the right to make, modify and experiment with
|> transmitters.
|>
|>This is interesting; however, there is no law against any CBer building a
|>transmitter and operating it on a valid CB frequency. [...]
```

Bravely stated, but 100% wrong. CB'ers may not build a transmitter for CB frequencies and use it. They may not modify existing transmitters for use on CB frequencies. (I don't want to get into one of the pointless arguments about what's legal .vs. what's done.)

--

>>>==>PStJTT  
Patrick St. Joseph Teahan Taber, KC1TD

If I was authorized to speak for my employer, I'd be too important to waste my time on this crap....

-----

Date: 5 Apr 91 15:42:14 GMT  
From: world!ksr!jfw@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Licensing Philosophy?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

chiles@chiles.slisp.cs.cmu.edu (Bill Chiles) writes:

```
>A friend was asking me the other day why one must learn some basic
>electronics to obtain a amateur radio license.
>Then he made two more points: with the state of modern gear, one or two can
>fix their own rigs without a factory, and the rigs do everything. The
>other point was that the government doesn't restrict the public's access to
>operating motor vehicles to those who demonstrate basic mechanic's skills.
>... Why then must a radio operator know about the internals of his gear
>to obtain access to the airwaves?
```

You don't have to know anything about radio to obtain access to the airwaves. If you want a no-knowledge radio license, go and buy a GMRS license, or get a CB radio. It's that simple. If you want to operate in the part of the spectrum that the FCC has set aside for people who have demonstrated some minimal knowledge of electronics and rules and regulations, then you'll have to demonstrate some minimal knowledge of electronics and rules and regulations.



What in heaven's name is wrong with this? If you want to operate in the spectrum reserved for aircraft, you have to be piloting a plane.

Digging slightly deeper, if you're going to be loosed in a playpen with (routine) worldwide propagation, you should at least learn about radio propagation, which is already a technical subject -- which is also the reasoning behind ensuring that no-test licenses (CB and GMRS) are kept from having worldwide propagation (of course, they blew it with the 27 MHz band).

Considering the state of technical education in the US, I think the number of things that require dumbing down is extremely small. If you want a telephone, you know where to get it -- don't demand that amateur radio provide telephone service also.

> Just thinking too much I suppose ....

Just not very hard.

-----

Date: 5 Apr 91 15:38:42 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Real info on scanner situation wanted  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Over here on the Internet mailing list side of Info-hams, I've seen a couple postings with the headers of "Scanner ban - here are the facts". But, unfortunately, these postings were NOT discussions of the subject, but instead followups about the language used in the original, which hasn't showed up here (yet).

Is this in regard to the item in the April Monitoring times? That was a last-page editorial that stated the FCC had accepted a proposal to restrict the legal coverage of scanners to eliminate police and public-safety frequencies.

I have no idea if this is true -- this was the APRIL edition of MT, after all, and electronics mags have a long history of spoof or spurious April-fool articles and items.

Other factors are that the FCC never legally restricted scanners or receivers from cellular coverage, even though the ECPA banned legal listening to those signals, while I believe the wording of the ECPA specifically stated that police/public-safety signals *were* legal listening fare (subject to the pre-existing non-disclosure restrictions of the 1930's radio act). So adopting this position would be inconsistent. (But no one ever claimed the FCC could do anything right, of course...)

In addition, the way this was described was that it was an out-of-the-blue proposal at an FCC commissioners' meeting. It would have to go through all the public-notice, request for comment, and associated long-term approval procedures before being enacted. The MT description didn't cite all this (and they DID have enough room on the page to add more text, so they could have).

So, could we have some REAL discussion of this, please? Is it a spoof or is it factual?

Regards, Will  
wmartin@stl-06sima.army.mil

-----  
Date: 5 Apr 91 15:15:12 GMT  
From: techpubs@burdvax.prc.unisys.com  
Subject: STS-37 SAREX Operating Schedule  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

STS-37 with its 5 member amateur radio operator crew successfully lifted off on April 5 at 14:23 UTC. This is an operating schedule for the SAREX activity updated for launch date and time. Reading left to right, Mission Elapsed Time in Days, Hours, and Minutes, UTC date and time in Day of the Month, hours, and minutes, and then Event. Note that the entry in the UTC D column is Day of the Month; so, for example, the first entry under UTC, 5 14 23, should be read as April 5 at 14:23 UTC. Also, be aware that Daylight Savings Time will begin during this mission. Don't let that confuse you. All times shown here are UTC which does not shift back and forth with the passing of the seasons. Time line information for this table comes from "STS-37 SAREX Information Summary" posted by Gary Morris (N5QWC) on 21 March, 1991. This information is the same time line summary posted from AMSAT.  
Good luck and happy shuttle DX to all.

Joseph M. Fedock N3IE  
Unisys DS,Inc/EISG/VFL  
Paoli, PA 19301  
(215) 648-2495  
techpubs@PRC.Unisys.COM  
joef@eps.gvl.unisys.com

MET			UTC			Event
D	Hr	Mn	D	Hr	Mn	
-	--	--	-	--	--	-----
0	0	0	5	14	23	Launch
0	6	55	5	21	18	Start_SAREX_Setup

0	7	0	5	21	23	Begin_Pre-Sleep_Activity
0	7	20	5	21	43	Finish_SAREX_Setup
0	10	0	6	0	23	Begin_Sleep_Period
0	18	0	6	8	23	Begin_Post-Sleep_Activity
0	21	0	6	11	23	End_Post-Sleep_Activity
0	21	50	6	12	13	Cabin_depress_to_10.2_PSI
0	23	12	6	13	35	AOS_FSTV_w/N9AB,_US_Bridge
0	23	30	6	13	53	LOS_FSTV_w/N9AB,_US_Bridge
1	0	51	6	15	14	AOS_School_#1_via_US_Bridge
1	1	9	6	15	32	LOS_School_#1_via_US_Bridge
1	2	29	6	16	52	AOS_School_#2_via_US_Bridge
1	2	47	6	17	10	LOS_School_#2_via_US_Bridge
1	4	9	6	18	32	AOS_School_#3_via_US_Bridge
1	4	25	6	18	48	LOS_School_#3_via_US_Bridge
1	6	0	6	20	23	Begin_Pre-Sleep_Activity
1	6	0	6	20	23	AOS_School_#4_via_SA_Bridge
1	6	21	6	20	44	LOS_School_#4_via_SA_Bridge
1	9	0	6	23	23	Begin_Sleep_Period
1	17	0	7	7	23	Begin_Post-Sleep_Activity
1	20	0	7	10	23	End_Post-Sleep_Activity
1	21	0	7	11	23	GRO_Grapple
1	21	10	7	11	33	GRO_Unberth
1	22	10	7	12	33	GRO_Solar_Array_Deploy
1	23	30	7	13	53	GRO_High_Gain_Antenna_Deploy
2	0	11	7	14	34	AOS_FSTV_w/W5RRR,_KE4PT_w/US_Bridge
2	0	31	7	14	54	LOS_FSTV_w/W5RRR,_KE4PT_w/US_Bridge
2	3	10	7	17	33	GRO_Release
2	6	0	7	20	23	Begin_Pre-Sleep_Activity
2	9	0	7	23	23	Begin_Sleep_Period
2	17	0	8	7	23	Begin_Post-Sleep_Activity
2	20	0	8	10	23	End_Post-Sleep_Activity
2	20	0	8	10	23	Begin_EVA_Prep
2	21	50	8	12	13	Unscheduled_SSTV/Packet
2	22	15	8	12	38	Airlock_Depress/Egress
2	23	20	8	13	43	Unscheduled_SSTV/Packet
3	0	50	8	15	13	Unscheduled_SSTV/Packet
3	2	20	8	16	43	Unscheduled_SSTV/Packet
3	4	30	8	18	53	Airlock_Ingress/Repress
3	5	15	8	19	38	Begin_Pre-Sleep_Activity
3	8	15	8	22	38	Begin_Sleep_Period
3	15	15	9	5	38	Begin_Post-Sleep_Activity
3	18	15	9	8	38	End_Post-Sleep_Activity
3	18	15	9	8	38	Cabin_repress_to_14.7_PSI
3	22	54	9	13	17	AOS_School_#5_US_Bridge
3	23	13	9	13	36	LOS_School_#5_US_Bridge
4	0	32	9	14	55	AOS_Backup_FSTV_or_w/W5RRR_US_Bridge
4	0	52	9	15	15	LOS_Backup_FSTV_or_w/W5RRR_US_Bridge
4	5	5	9	19	28	Begin_Pre-Sleep_Activity

4	5	10	9	19	33	Start_SAREX_Stow
4	5	40	9	20	3	Finish_SAREX_Stow
4	8	5	9	22	28	Begin_Sleep_Period
4	16	5	10	6	28	Begin_Post-Sleep_Activity
4	19	5	10	9	28	End_Post-Sleep_Activity
4	23	5	10	13	28	Deorbit_Burn
5	0	10	10	14	33	EDW_Landing

-----

Date: 5 Apr 91 17:56:56 GMT  
 From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!unix.cis.pitt.edu!dsinc!netnews.upenn.edu!  
 platypus!bill@ucsd.edu  
 Subject: Ultrasonics.  
 To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <7154@mace.cc.purdue.edu>, dil@mace.cc.purdue.edu (Perry G Ramsey)  
 writes:

>  
 > Seriously, how does the dog know what the sound means when he hears it,  
 > unless he's been trained to respond to it in some way.  
 >

One way would be to find a pitch/frequency that caused intense pain or  
 that scrambled brain-waves (is that possible remotely?)

Of course, the big question is did the dog pass the no-code tech exam and  
 was he ordering pizza on the repeater??

--

Bill Gunshannon		If this statement wasn't here,
bill@platypus.uofs.edu		This space would be left intentionally blank
bill@tuatara.uofs.edu		#include <std disclaimer.h>

-----

Date: 5 Apr 91 17:44:53 GMT  
 From: decrcrl!news.crl.dec.com!shlump.nac.dec.com!  
 koning.enet.dec.com@decwrl.dec.com  
 Subject: Working with Phillystran  
 To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

|>

|>We received a roll of the super-heavy Phillystran (about the same diameter  
 |>as RG8). I was told it was the "new type" -- you no longer had to  
 |>buy the special termination kits. Supposedly it just requires using  
 |>a thimble and a few (3?) clamps to properly terminate it. Is this correct?  
 |>

```
|>                                     --- Jeff
|>--
|>-----
|> Jeff DePolo   N3HBZ/AE           Twisted Pair: (215) 386-7199
|> depolo@eniac.seas.upenn.edu     RF: 146.685- 442.70+ 144.455s (Philadelphia)
|> University of Pennsylvania      Carrier Pigeon: 420 S. 42nd St. Phila PA 19104
|>
```

The way I understand it, the new style no longer requires termination by potting (casting exoxy-like stuff). But it DOES require termination devices specifically made for it. You should ask the manufacturer. It doesn't make sense to pay a small fortune for tower, guys, and antennas, only to have the whole thing fall down because steel wire clamps don't hold on Phyllistran.

paul

PS. Eniac? Cute...

-----  
Date: 5 Apr 91 13:49:02 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!hollie.rdg.dec.com!ryn.mro4.dec.com!ultnix.enet.dec.com!  
taber@decwrl.dec.com  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <21707@shlump.nac.dec.com>, <1458@rust.zso.dec.com>,  
<1991Apr4.174647.5669@netcom.COM>tabe  
Reply-To : taber@ultnix.enet.dec.com (Patrick St. Joseph Teahan Taber)  
Subject : Re: No-Code Testing Questions

In article <1991Apr4.174647.5669@netcom.COM>, edg@netcom.COM (Ed Greenberg) writes:

```
|>
|>A technician (issued after 14 Feb) who passes a code test will not
|>receive a new license. S/he will not have a form 610 sent to the
|>government. The burden of proof will be on the technician to prove
|>that
|>any HF license was legal. The situation is the same as for somebody
|>who has upgraded, and is waiting for a new license. The operation
|>based
|>on the CSCE is legal, but if questioned, the licensee must produce
|>the
|>CSCE.
|>
|>One big difference is that the Technician who wishes to operate HF
|>must
|>retain the documentation FOREVER, and it's not replacable.
```

Not exactly true. Evidence of passing a code test will be forwarded to the FCC where it will be retained in the their records. So there is no "burden of proof" on the upgraded Tech. The only people who can question the validity of the ticket are FCC employees, and they'll already know if the tech in question has passed a test or not (assuming time has passed for the paperwork to be processed. Surely it's reasonable to expect that they'd hang on to the CSCE that long.) So there is never a need to "prove" qualification unless the licensee chooses to.

Since the FCC has to store the data somewhere, I wouldn't be surprised if the code test info eventually found its way into the callsign tapes and thus into the callbook.

--

>>>==>PStJTT

Patrick St. Joseph Teahan Taber, KC1TD

If I was authorized to speak for my employer, I'd be too important to waste my time on this crap....

-----

Date: 5 Apr 91 19:04:28 GMT  
From: brian@ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1458@rust.zso.dec.com>, <1991Apr4.174647.5669@netcom.COM>, <4304@ryn.mro4.dec.com>  
Subject : Re: No-Code Testing Questions

>In article <1991Apr4.174647.5669@netcom.COM>, edg@netcom.COM (Ed >Greenberg) writes:  
>One big difference is that the Technician who wishes to operate HF >must  
>retain the documentation FOREVER, and it's not replacable.

What I think most discussants in this continuing story are missing is that point that the FCC has essentially said that whether you've passed the code test or not isn't really very important to them. My guess is that they really don't care at all - only pharisaical fellow hams are going to get all hot and bothered.

Those are probably the same type of people that keep worrying about what kind of sex the neighbors are having. Hmmph. Seems to me that if you can't make some sort of helpful contribution, the very least you could do was to not get in the way.

- Brian

-----  
Date: 5 Apr 91 16:22:22 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!uakari.primite.wisc.edu!aplcn!boingo.med.jhu.edu!haven!  
wam.umd.edu!rustyh@ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2646@ke4zv.UUCP>, <1991Apr2.071321.27899@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>,  
<2679@ke4zv.UUCP>  
Subject : Re: ATV: AM or FM

In article <2679@ke4zv.UUCP> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:  
>In article <1991Apr2.071321.27899@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu> phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu (Phil  
Howard KA9WGN) writes:  
>>gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:  
>>  
>  
>  
>There is quite a bit of phase wobble in satellite signals. It's fun  
>to watch your uplink coming back from the bird and see the vectorscope  
>spin first one way then the other.

At the time when the first "Aussat" satellite was launched in Australia  
we were measuring the dopler shift of the 4.433MHz colour subcarrier  
on a vectorscope (watching our signal coming back with the vectorscope  
locked to "station sync"). It turned out our measurement had better  
precision than the method used by the space systems people at Aussat!

--  
Michael Katzmann (VK2BEA/G4NYV/NV3Z) Please email to this address |  
Broadcast Sports Technology |  
2135 Espey Ct. #4 \\\/  
Crofton MD 21114-2442 (301) 721-5151 ...uunet!opel!vk2bea!michael

-----  
End of Info-Hams Digest  
\*\*\*\*\*